

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
amandas@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Scott Johnson,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Twohy Apartments, LP**, a  
California Limited Partnership;  
**Scott's Park Avenue SJ, LLC**, a  
California Limited Liability  
Company

Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For Violations  
Of: Americans With Disabilities  
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Twohy Apartments, LP, a California Limited Partnership; Scott's Park Avenue SJ, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially equipped van.

2. Defendant Twohy Apartments, LP owned the real property located at or

1 about 200 S 1<sup>st</sup> St, San Jose, California, in September 2020 and October 2020.

2 3. Defendant Twohy Apartments, LP owns the real property located at or  
3 about 200 S 1<sup>st</sup> St, San Jose, California, currently.

4 4. Defendant Scott's Park Avenue SJ, LLC owned Scott's Seafood located  
5 at or about 200 S 1<sup>st</sup> St, San Jose, California, in September 2020 and October  
6 2020.

7 5. Defendant Scott's Park Avenue SJ, LLC owns Scott's Seafood  
8 ("Restaurant") located at or about 200 S 1<sup>st</sup> St, San Jose, California, currently.

9 6. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
10 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
11 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
12 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
13 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is  
14 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary  
15 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when  
16 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants  
17 are ascertained.

18  
19 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

20 7. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
21 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
22 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

23 8. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
24 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
25 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights  
26 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

27 9. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
28 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is

1 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

2  
3 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

4 10. Plaintiff went to the Restaurant in September 2020 and October 2020  
5 (twice) with the intention to avail himself of its goods motivated in part to  
6 determine if the defendants comply with the disability access laws.

7 11. The Restaurant is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
8 accommodation, and a business establishment.

9 12. Unfortunately, on the dates of the plaintiff's visits, the defendants failed  
10 to provide wheelchair accessible dining surfaces in conformance with the ADA  
11 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

12 13. The Restaurant provides dining surfaces to its customers but fails to  
13 provide wheelchair accessible dining surfaces.

14 14. The problems that plaintiff encountered is the lack of sufficient knee or  
15 toe clearance under the dining surfaces for wheelchair users. Additionally,  
16 other tables were too high.

17 15. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the dining surfaces that  
18 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant  
19 dining surfaces available for wheelchair users.

20 16. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
21 wheelchair accessible dining surfaces.

22 17. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff  
23 personally encountered these barriers.

24 18. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use  
25 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the  
26 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

27 19. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and  
28 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

1       20. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
2 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
3 disabilities.

4       21. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
5 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the  
6 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
7 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
8 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
9 access if complete removal were not achievable.

10       22. Plaintiff will return to the Restaurant to avail himself of its goods and to  
11 determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is represented to  
12 him that the Restaurant and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff is currently  
13 deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing barriers and  
14 his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the site. If the  
15 barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and discriminatory  
16 barriers again.

17       23. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
18 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
19 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
20 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
21 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
22 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
23 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
24 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
25 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

26  
27 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS**  
28 **WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all

1 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

2 24. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
3 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
4 complaint.

5 25. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the  
6 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any  
7 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone  
8 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.  
9 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- 10 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,  
11 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford  
12 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
13 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the  
14 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those  
15 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- 16 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is  
17 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are  
18 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- 19 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the  
20 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are  
21 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,  
22 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the  
23 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and  
24 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the  
25 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals  
26 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

27 26. When a business provides facilities such as dining surfaces, it must  
28 provide accessible dining surfaces.

1 27. Here, accessible dining surfaces have not been provided in  
2 conformance with the ADA Standards.

3 28. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
4 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the  
5 1991 Standards.

6 29. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition  
7 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
8 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

9 30. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
10 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

11  
12 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
13 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
14 Code § 51-53.)

15 31. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
16 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
17 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
18 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
19 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
20 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
21 Civ. Code §51(b).

22 32. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
23 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

24 33. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
25 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s  
26 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
27 privileges, or services offered.

28 34. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,

1 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
2 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
3 (c).)

4 35. Although the plaintiff encountered frustration and difficulty by facing  
5 discriminatory barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting  
6 physical symptoms, the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical  
7 personal injury greater than the amount of the statutory damages.

8  
9 **PRAYER:**

10 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
11 relief as follows:

12 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
13 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
14 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
15 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

16 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
17 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

18 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
19 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

20  
21 Dated: November 24, 2020 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

22  
23 

24 By: \_\_\_\_\_

25 Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
26 Attorney for plaintiff  
27  
28